UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/046,941	01/15/2002	William Kress Bodin	AUS920010464US1	4426

34533   7590   10/20/2005

INTERNATIONAL CORP (BLF)
c/o BIGGERS & OHANIAN, LLP
P.O. BOX 1469
AUSTIN, TX 78767-1469

EXAMINER
LY, ANH

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
2162	

DATE MAILED: 10/20/2005

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

PTO-90C (Rev. 10/03)

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.
- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133).
- Any reply received by the Office.later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

1)☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on *10 August 2005*.

2a)☐ This action is **FINAL.**   2b)☒ This action is non-final.

3)☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

4)☒ Claim(s) *1-18* is/are pending in the application.

    4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.

5)☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.

6)☒ Claim(s) *1-18* is/are rejected.

7)☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.

8)☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

9)☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.

10)☒ The drawing(s) filed on *15 January 2002* is/are: a)☒ accepted or b)☐ objected to by the Examiner.

    Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).

    Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).

11)☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

12)☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).

    a)☐ All   b)☐ Some * c)☐ None of:

      1.☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.

      2.☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.

      3.☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

    * See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

1)☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)

2)☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)

3)☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08)
    Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____.

4)☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413)
    Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____ .

5)☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)

6)☐ Other: _____.

DETAILED ACTION

1.   This Office Action is response to Applicants' response filed 08/10/2005.

2.   Claims 1-18 are pending in this Application.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

3.   The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all

obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

> (a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set
> forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and
> the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the
> invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains.
> Patentability shall not be negatived by the manner in which the invention was made.

4.   This application currently names joint inventors. In considering patentability of

the claims under 35 U.S.C. 103(a), the examiner presumes that the subject matter of

the various claims was commonly owned at the time any inventions covered therein

were made absent any evidence to the contrary. Applicant is advised of the obligation

under 37 CFR 1.56 to point out the inventor and invention dates of each claim that was

not commonly owned at the time a later invention was made in order for the examiner to

consider the applicability of 35 U.S.C. 103(c) and potential 35 U.S.C. 102(e), (f) or (g)

prior art under 35 U.S.C. 103(a).

5.   Claims 1, 4-5, 7, 10-11, 13 and 16-17 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as

being unpatentable over US Patent No.: 6,091,409 issued to Dickman et al. (hereinafter

Dickman) in view of Pub. No.: US 2002/0115476 A1 of Padawer et al. (hereinafter

Padawer).

With respect to claim 1, Dickman teaches selecting a context (selecting a context

from a context menu: figs. 18 and 22; col. 10, lines 18-30 and col. 11, lines 20-28);

receiving a shortcut entered through the user interface (from the context menu, a

shortcut is selected or received via the user interface by clicking on the context menu:

figs. 18 & 22, abstract and col. 7, lines 1-12);

inferring from a context definition table, in dependence upon the context, a

context table name and a context field name (col. 9, lines 8-36); and

displaying selected records through the user interface on the client device (col. 7,

lines 1-12 and col. 9, lines 8-18).

Dickman teaches context to be selected via popup context menu, and the

shortcut is received via user interface from the context menu, and the context is

displayed to the user. Dickman does not clearly teach the shortcut having a associated

with it a shortcut field name set comprising one or more shortcut field names; and

selecting information records from an information database in dependence upon the

context, the context table name, the shortcut field name and the context field name.

However, Padawer teaches shortcut data store , shortcut name as a string, which

can then be displayed so that a user can be view (figs. 3 and 10, sections 0056-0058).

Therefore, it would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art at

the time the invention was made to combine the teachings of Dickman with the

teachings of Padawer, One having ordinary skill in the art would have found it motivated

to utilize the use of selecting information records from a shortcut data store and shortcut

field name (Padawer's section 0056-0058), into the system of Dickman for the purpose

of reducing the number of steps to access desired information, thereby, helping the use

of mobile devices more efficient (Padawer's sections 0001 and 0006-0009).

With respect to claim 4, Dickman teaches wherein selecting a context further

comprises receiving a context from the client device, the context entered by a user

through the user interface (fig. 18 and fig. 22).

With respect to claim 5, Dickman teaches a method of presenting information

through a user interface as discussed in claim 1.

Dickman teaches context to be selected via popup context menu, and the

shortcut is received via user interface from the context menu, and the context is

displayed to the user. Dickman does not clearly teach a new context value to the

context.

However, Padawer teaches a new context as well as shortcut (fig. 11 and fig. 12;

sections 0057-0058).

Therefore, it would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art at

the time the invention was made to combine the teachings of Dickman with the

teachings of Padawer, One having ordinary skill in the art would have found it motivated

to utilize the use of a new context value from a new shortcut (Padawer's section 0057-

0058), into the system of Dickman for the purpose of reducing the number of steps to

access desired information, thereby, helping the use of mobile devices more efficient

(Padawer's sections 0001 and 0006-0009).

Claim 7 is essentially the same as claim 1 except that it is directed to a system rather than a method, and is rejected for the same reason as applied to the claim 1 hereinabove.

Claim 10 is essentially the same as claim 4 except that it is directed to a system rather than a method, and is rejected for the same reason as applied to the claim 4 hereinabove.

Claim 11 is essentially the same as claim 5 except that it is directed to a system rather than a method, and is rejected for the same reason as applied to the claim 5 hereinabove.

Claim 13 is essentially the same as claim 1 except that it is directed to a computer program product rather than a method, and is rejected for the same reason as applied to the claim 1 hereinabove.

Claim 16 is essentially the same as claim 4 except that it is directed to a computer program product rather than a method, and is rejected for the same reason as applied to the claim 4 hereinabove.

Claim 17 is essentially the same as claim 5 except that it is directed to a computer program product rather than a method, and is rejected for the same reason as applied to the claim 5 hereinabove.

6.   Claims 2-3, 6, 8-9, 12, 14-15 and 18 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as

being unpatentable over US Patent No.: 6,091,409 issued to Dickman et al. (hereinafter

Dickman) in view of Pub. No.: US 2002/0115476 A1 of Padawer et al. (hereinafter

Padawer) and further in view of Pub. No.: US 2004/0233235 A1 of Rubin et al.

(hereinafter Rubin).

With respect to claim 2, Dickman in view of Padawer discloses a context aware,

shortcut method of presenting information through a user interface as discussed in

claim 1.

Dickman and Padawer disclose substantially the invention as claimed.

Dickman and Padawer do not teach wherein the selecting records further

comprising creating a query for context and shortcut.

However, Rubin teaches the navigation context is a database containing a

plurality of records for querying or searching via user interface (sections 0201, 206-

0211; also see abstract).

Therefore, it would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art at

the time the invention was made to combine the teachings of Dickman in view of

Padawer with the teachings of Rubin by incorporating the use of creating a query for

context and shortcut into the system of Dickman. The motivation being to reduce the

number of steps to access desired information, thereby, helping the use of mobile

devices more efficient.

With respect to claim 3, Dickman in view of Padawer discloses a context aware, shortcut method of presenting information through a user interface as discussed in claim 1.

Dickman and Padawer disclose substantially the invention as claimed.

Dickman and Padawer do not teach wherein the selecting a default context.

However, Rubin teaches wherein selecting a context further comprises selecting a default context (sections 0074-0076).

Therefore, it would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to combine the teachings of Dickman in view of Padawer with the teachings of Rubin by incorporating the use of creating a query for context and shortcut into the system of Dickman. The motivation being to reduce the number of steps to access desired information, thereby, helping the use of mobile devices more efficient.

With respect to claim 6, Dickman in view of Padawer discloses a context aware, shortcut method of presenting information through a user interface as discussed in claim 1.

Dickman and Padawer disclose substantially the invention as claimed.

Dickman and Padawer do not teach wherein displaying selected records through the user interface on the client device further comprises downloading the selected records to the client device for display in the display form.

However, Rubin teaches the navigation context is a database containing a plurality of records for querying or searching via user interface (displaying format such

as region, frame: sections 0014-0018 and 0043 and downloading the content: section
0050).

Therefore, it would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art at
the time the invention was made to combine the teachings of Dickman in view of
Padawer with the teachings of Rubin by incorporating the use of displaying and
downloading records into the system of Dickman. The motivation being to reduce the
number of steps to access desired information, thereby, helping the use of mobile
devices more efficient.

Claim 8 is essentially the same as claim 2 except that it is directed to a system
rather than a method, and is rejected for the same reason as applied to the claim 2
hereinabove.

Claim 9 is essentially the same as claim 3 except that it is directed to a system
rather than a method, and is rejected for the same reason as applied to the claim 3
hereinabove.

Claim 12 is essentially the same as claim 6 except that it is directed to a system
rather than a method, and is rejected for the same reason as applied to the claim 6
hereinabove.

Claim 14 is essentially the same as claim 2 except that it is directed to a
computer program product rather than a method, and is rejected for the same reason as
applied to the claim 2 hereinabove.

Claim 15 is essentially the same as claim 3 except that it is directed to a computer program product rather than a method, and is rejected for the same reason as applied to the claim 3 hereinabove.

Claim 18 is essentially the same as claim 6 except that it is directed to a computer program product rather than a method, and is rejected for the same reason as applied to the claim 6 hereinabove.

Contact Information

7.   Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the
examiner should be directed to Anh Ly whose telephone number is (571) 272-4039 or
via E-Mail: ANH.LY@USPTO.GOV **or fax to (571) 273-4039**. The examiner can
normally be reached on TUESDAY – THURSDAY from 8:30 AM – 3:30 PM.
If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's
supervisor, John Breene, can be reached on (571) 272-4107 or **Primary Examiner**
Jean Corrielus (571) 272-4032.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the
Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published
applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status
information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For
more information about the PAIR system, see **http://pair-direct.uspto.gov**. Should you
have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business
Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

Any response to this action should be mailed to: Commissioner of Patents and
Trademarks, Washington, D.C. 20231, or faxed to: Central Fax Center (571) 273-8300

ANH LY
OCT. 4th, 2005

JEAN M CORRIELUS
PRIMARY EXAMINER